



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,497	08/08/2001	Laurence Dubreil	045636-5044	5555

9629 7590 01/25/2002

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

TRAN LIEN, THUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------


1761

2

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SW

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/831,497</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Dubreil et al</b>	
	Examiner <b>Lien Tran</b>	Art Unit <b>1761</b>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 8, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>7</u> | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

Art Unit: 1761

1. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout and content for patent applications. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

The following order or arrangement is preferred in framing the specification and, except for the reference to "Microfiche Appendix" and the drawings, each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as section headings. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) Title of the Invention.
  - (b) Cross-References to Related Applications.
  - © Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research or Development.
  - (d) Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix" (see 37 CFR 1.96).
  - (e) Background of the Invention.
    1. Field of the Invention.
    2. Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
  - (f) Brief Summary of the Invention.
  - (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s).
  - (h) Detailed Description of the Invention.
  - (I) Claim or Claims (commencing on a separate sheet).
  - (j) Abstract of the Disclosure (commencing on a separate sheet).
  - (k) Drawings.
  - (l) Sequence Listing (see 37 CFR 1.821-1.825).
2. The specification does not have a " Brief Description of the Drawings" which is required in application containing drawings.
  3. Claims 15-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1761

In claim 15: Lines 2-3, the reference to " the final baked product" is not clear because the claim has not set forth any baked product. Line 3, the reference to " the other ingredients" is not clear because the claim has not set forth any other ingredients.

Claim 16 is vague and indefinite because claim 15 has not set forth the presence of flour.

In claim 17, the reference to " the flour" is unclear for the same reason set forth in claim 16.

In claim 18, " the dough" does not have antecedent basis.

In claim 25, " the additional biscuit ingredients" do not have antecedent basis.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 15-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubreil et al.

Art Unit: 1761


Dubreil et al teach the addition of puroindolines to wheat flour used in breadmaking. They disclose that low amounts of puroindolines can induce important changes in the structure of grain crumb and bread volumes and puroindolines are promising as natural additives. Puroindolines in amounts of .05%, .1% and .2% w/w are added to flour.

Dubreil et al do not disclose adding puroindolines to biscuit products and the controlling of texture and density.

It would have been obvious to add puroindolines to biscuit products because biscuit is a dough product and contains similar ingredients as the bread product disclosed by Debreil et al. If it is known to add puroindolines to bread product to affect certain properties, it would have been obvious to add the additives to other types of dough products. As to the steps of controlling the texture and density, it is obvious such steps are done in Dubreil et al because the same additives are used and the amounts are within the ranges claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1868. The examiner can normally be reached on Wed-Fri. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

  
LIEN TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
